

### REMARKS

Applicants express appreciation to the Examiner for the telephonic interview granted to applicants' representative. As presented herein for consideration the claims have been amended as discussed at the interview. Specifically, independent claims 1, 14, 15, and 30 and dependent claims 2, 5, 9 and 16 have been amended.<sup>1</sup> Thus, by this paper, claims 1-32 are presented for the Examiner's reconsideration

As defined in independent claim 1 and its corresponding computer program product claim (claim 14), applicants' inventive method is directed to recognizing natural human input. Claim 1 defines receiving, at a system component, natural input data directed to an input field from a plurality of input fields of an executing program, wherein the natural input data comprises an input other than textual input. The natural input data is entered into the computing device by a user of the computing device. Each input field has a context associated with a corresponding user-specific biasing information that is different from user-specific biasing information of one or more other input fields. Next, claim 1 defines determining, external to the executing program, the context of the input field. Next, claim 1 defines retrieving corresponding user-specific biasing information for the input field based on the determined context of the input field. Next, claim 1 defines analyzing the natural input data directed to the input field based on the user-specific biasing information retrieved for the input field. Lastly, claim 1 defines providing a recognition result of the natural input data to the executing program for inclusion in the input field. The recognition result is biased by the user-specific biasing information and comprises at least one computer code corresponding to recognition of the natural input.

Independent claims 15 and 30 are system claims directed to systems for converting natural input data.

In the office action claims 1, 14, 15, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kang et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,741,994) hereinafter *Kang*. *Kang* describes a method for organizing data. After data is entered into a field, portions of the data are tokenized into different token categories. (Col. 7, l. 41 – Col. 8, l. 46). The application reads each character from the start of each line until a space is reached. Upon reaching a space the

---

<sup>1</sup> Support for the amendments to the claims are found throughout the originally filed claims, specification, and Figures, including, [page 17, lines 12-18], [page 29, lines 15 – page 30, line 8], [page 32, lines 3-14], and [page 33, line 8 – page 34, line 8] and Figures 2 and 5.

application categorizes the characters preceding the space as a specified record type, such as, for example, TEXT, NUMBER, TELEPHONE, etc. (Col. 8, ll. 4 - 46). When the application is unable to ascertain the particular record type further analysis is performed and additional groups of characters can also be categorized by record type. (Col. 8, l. 47 - Col. 9, l. 14).

However, the *Kang* does not anticipate or make obvious Applicant's inventive method for recognizing natural human input. In particular, *Kang* does not anticipate or make obvious receiving, at a system component, natural input data directed to an input field from a plurality of input fields of an executing program, wherein the natural input data comprises an input other than textual input, the natural input data entered into the computing device by a user of the computing device, each input field having a context associated with a corresponding user-specific biasing information that is different from user-specific biasing information of one or more other input fields. Further, *Kang* does not anticipate or make obvious analyzing the natural input data directed to the input field based on the user-specific biasing information retrieved for the input field.

For at least either of these reasons, applicants also submit that claims 1, 14, 15, and 30 patentably define over the prior art of record. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the prior art is thus respectfully requested.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 13<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER  
Registration No. 28,651  
MICHAEL B. DODD  
Registration No. 46,437  
Attorneys for Applicant  
Customer No. 47973